

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

CA 3230 OF 1998 IN

In Appeal from order No.446 of 1992.

Dhansukhlal Amritlal Parekh. Applicant.

Versus.

Godrej Boyce Manuf.

..Respondents.

Jaideep Mitra i/b M/s.Desai & Chinoy for
for the Appellants.

K.K. Mehta with A.J. Dhapsekar i/b Payne &
Co.for respondents.

CORAM:A.M.KHANWILKAR,J.

DATED:18.03.2006

P.C.:-

.

Heard the learned counsel for the parties.

Perused the application. This application is
opposed by the counsel for the respondent, on the
argument that appellants have not brought on record
all the trustees of the respondent Trust. This
argument overlooks that in the present application,
which I am required to consider today, is for the
limited purpose for bringing on record heirs of
deceased respondent no.4./original appellant no.4.
The fact that all the trustees of respondent trust
are not brought on record, is not relevant, for
deciding this application. As it is not in dispute
that the deceased appellant has been named as
respondent in the cognate CRA No. 612/92, this

order would also enable the applicant in Civil
Revision Application to carry out the amendment to
the cause title, so as to bring on record heirs of
deceased appellant, who has been named as
respondent, in the said revision. Hence, this
application is made absolute in terms of prayer
Clause (4).

2. The amendment to be carried out within two
weeks from today, in both proceedings.

[A.M.KHANWILKAR. J]